

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
#1	<p>The Utah Division of Water Quality staff has reviewed the referenced Environmental Assessment Report. It is our opinion that applicable water quality standards may be violated unless appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) are incorporated to minimize the erosion-sediment load to the Colorado River or any adjacent waters or dry washes during project activities and operation of the facilities. We strongly recommend that appropriate water quality parameters be monitored for effectiveness of sediment control and other applicable BMPs.</p> <p>Potential impacts from runoff during construction or during long-term operation of the bridge and road may include the degradation of water quality, increased quantities and intensities of peak flows, channel erosion, cause an inability of streams to achieve ecological balance and regain their designated beneficial uses. Emphasis in design should avoid concentration of storm water to fewer drainage locations. The intent should be to allow or mimic the natural flow patterns to the degree possible.</p> <p>The Division of Water Quality requests the following conditions be included in the final Environmental Assessment Report (EA), as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whenever a construction project causes the water turbidity in an adjacent surface water to increase by 10 NTU's or more, the responsible party shall notify the Division of Water Quality. 2. The responsible party shall not use any fill material that may leach organic chemicals (e.g., discarded asphalt) or nutrients (e.g., phosphate rock) into the receiving water. 3. The responsible party shall protect any potentially affected fish spawning areas. 4. Coffor Dams are encouraged to be used to divert flow around instream construction activities and to reduce sediment loading to the river. Efforts should be made to control petroleum hydrocarbons (oil, antifreeze, diesel fuel, etc.) from entering the river from heavy equipment working from temporary barges. 5. The following permits from our Division are required during the construction phase of the project, as identified by the draft EA: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Construction activities that grade one acre or more per common plan are required to obtain coverage under the Utah Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (UPDES) Storm Water General Permit for Construction Activities, Permit No. UTR100000. The permit require the development of a storm water pollution prevention plan to be implemented and updated from the commencement of any grading activities at the site until final stabilization of the project. A fact sheet describing the permit requirements and application procedures is located on our web site waterquality.utah.gov b. Dewatering activities, if necessary during the construction, may require coverage under the UPDES General Permit for Construction Dewatering, Permit No. UTG070000. The permit requires water quality monitoring every two weeks to ensure that the pumped water is meeting permit effluent limitations, unless the water is managed on the construction site. 6. In addition to these permitting requirements, the Division of Water Quality requires the submission of plan elements for permanent storm water runoff control and treatment. The plan should identify where the 	<p>Appropriate BMPs will be incorporated to minimize the erosion-sediment load to the Colorado River, adjacent waters, and dry washes. Water quality parameters will be monitored to evaluate the effectiveness of sediment control and BMPs. The hydraulic analysis will be completed during design and the drainage design will be developed to avoid concentration of storm water and mimic natural flow patterns where reasonable to do so. The following requested conditions have been added to Section 3.9.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DWQ will be notified if water turbidity in adjacent surface water is increased by 10 NTU's or more as a result of the construction activities. • As part of the Section 402 permitting process, a SWPPP will be developed and incorporated in the design plans and construction contract documents. Plan elements for permanent storm water runoff control and treatment that are included in the SWPPP will be submitted to and reviewed by the DWQ. • Dewatering activities, if necessary during the construction, may require coverage under the UPDES General Permit for Construction Dewatering (Permit No. UTG070000). This permit requires water quality monitoring to ensure pumped water is meeting permit effluent limitations, unless the water is managed on the construction site. <p>The remaining requested conditions are already captured in existing commitments stated in Section 3.9.8 and Section 3.14.6.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>additional runoff from the bridge and road expansion will be discharged to in addition to the detention ponds identified in the draft EA. The plan should also include BMPs for revegetation with native plants in disturbed areas and a buffer strip along the road to filter petroleum, sediments and other contaminants from entering waters of the State.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to partner with UDOT on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Shelly Quick at (801) 538-6516.</p>	
#2	<p>Good maps and different potential plans for road with paths or medians options.</p> <p>The present Main Street Hwy 191 section on the north end of town, specifically where 400 North connects to Main, is difficult to make a left turn from 400 North onto Main due to change of two lanes to one just to the north of 400 North.</p>	<p>The comment regarding the maps and plans is appreciated.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative will improve the operation of this intersection. This alternative provides two travel lanes and a center turn lane through this section, eliminating the taper from two lanes to one that currently occurs just north of 400 North.</p>
#3	<p>The proposed plan shows responsiveness to comments made in original scoping. The cross-section from 600 North to Bridge now shows a detached meandering trail on the east side. Thank you. I look forward to further cooperation.</p>	<p>No response necessary.</p>
#4	<p>Thank you for looking at this project and not affecting all of the businesses from Century 21 to Canyon Voyages! Some issues that I see: 1) 4 Lanes = faster speeds into town. The traffic needs to be slowed down from 500 N – 400 N. 2) How will you enter the highway from 500 N and 400 N. There needs to be STOP LIGHTS. *This will also slow down the traffic* 3) Where and what do you do when the bike lane ends? Now where do I go? Have the city continue the bike lanes through town from 400 N and off of Main Street. 4) Major drainage issues need to be fixed behind La Hacienda. Main Street gets flooded way to often. Storm drains need to be installed with this project. Thanks for the time.</p>	<p>1) The design speed of the section from 400 North to the Colorado River Bridge would match the design speed of the Moab Main Street Project, which is 40 mph.</p> <p>2) During design, these intersections will be evaluated to determine if a signal is warranted, based on UDOT signal warrant criteria.</p> <p>3) Figure 1-3 identifies trails planned by Moab City. Shoulders will be designed to accommodate use by bicyclists.</p> <p>4) As recognized in the Draft EA, Moab, Grand County, and UDOT are working jointly to address existing drainage problems and flooding concerns independent of this project.</p>
#5	<p>To start, let me explain our situation. We recently closed on a property located at 415 N Main, a property which has been marked for removal. We closed on this building on November 15th, 2006. We showed a formal interest in this property at the beginning of 2006 and put in an offer through our Realtor. From that point, until closing, not one person that we dealt with in the buying process told us anything about a proposed road widening project, or even that access maybe required to our property by people involved in the project to make surveys (as intimated in the letter dated 15th November 2005, sent to property owners). If we had known anything about this, we would never have bought the property which has meant that we have invested our lifesavings to further our future, business, and livelihood. We</p>	<p>FHWA and UDOT deeply regret that the commenter was unaware of the proposed project and its associated impacts prior to the purchase of this business property. As part of the community outreach for this project (explained in Chapter 6), UDOT has placed paid advertisements in local and statewide newspapers and mailings were sent to individuals on the project mailing list, which included property owners adjacent to US-191. Information about the limits of the project, the proposed widening, and that</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>learnt about this through the owners of The Adventure Inn, whose property is also marked for displacement.</p> <p>We purchased this property to operate our business from. We run a Rock Climbing and Canyoneering Guide Service called Moab Desert Adventures, and we employ up to 8 people. We plan to have the shop open in February ready for the Spring season. We found ourselves in a situation where we are stuck with a building we could not sell, and any investments we make in the building will not be realized, and our hopes and dreams for our future and our business being destroyed. From the moment we found out, we have endeavored to find out as much as possible about the project, and try to get the decision reversed. We have had great support from City officials including the Mayor and David Olsen from the Planning and Development department, and the Chamber of Commerce, to save our building, and we have been told by UDOT and Michael Baker Inc. that our building will remain intact, and that there is no need to remove it. The only problem seems to be with the awning.</p> <p>We would like to make the following comments on the project as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to resolve this situation with the minimum amount of impact to everybody, especially us as our business, financial future and livelihood depend on our investment. From talking with Lorraine Richards and the engineers at Michael Baker Inc and Myron Lee at UDOT, it seems that we can come to a solution where our building will remain intact and not be removed. This is obviously the course we want to go. • In our discussions with Michael Baker Inc and UDOT, it has been stated that after closer inspection into our situation, the awning could possibly be encroaching on UDOT ROW. Michael Baker Inc has said that they will order a survey to clarify the property boundaries. Our awning would possibly need to be removed or altered so that it doesn't interfere with the sidewalk. We have been told that if the preferred build alternative plan is approved, then our awning would have to be taken care of, but our building would remain intact. The required measurements of road lanes, shoulder and sidewalk are within the ADA standards, and therefore it is not necessary to remove our building. • Aside from the human factor involved in this, which you cannot put a value on because of the destruction it will cause in the lives of those affected - loss of income, loss of business, ruination of future and livelihood, stress related issues etc, having to acquire a building is a costly exercise. You can save yourselves a lot of money, and keep our lives intact at the same time by keeping buildings intact. • We have been told quite categorically, that our building will remain intact. It does not need to be removed. This is obviously the solution which we want, and we are moving forward with our business on this premise, so it would be very unfair after telling us this, to decide otherwise. We have the support of the Mayor of Moab, and David Olsen from the Planning and Development Department for the City of Moab. • One of the main problems that has arisen in this process is the lack of communication, and the lack of knowledge that people in Moab had of this project. The road widening phase of the project has been hidden under the auspices of the Colorado Bridge replacement, and it seems that nobody knew exactly what was involved in the road widening phase of the project. We have spoken with members of the City, who are very concerned about our situation. They have stated that they were ill informed about the intention of removing properties. In future it would be more ethical to present all the information to avoid situations like the one we 	<p>there would be potential displacements involved, have been included in handouts sent with mailings to adjacent property owners. Information regarding property ownership was obtained from County Records. All project-related notices for this property since the beginning of the EA study efforts have been to the property address of 415 N Main. None of these notices were returned except the follow-up reminder postcard notice that was sent in December 4, 2006 for the Public Hearing. By this time, the new property owners had heard about the project from other individuals who had received the public hearing notice and project handout and had already initiated discussions with the project team. Since the new owners had just secured the property in November, earlier notice was not possible because they were not recorded as owners in the County Records. Once the project team was aware of the situation, the new owners were added to the project mailing list, a copy of the public hearing notice and project handout was provided, and discussions continued.</p> <p>The analysis typically conducted for an EA is a worse-case scenario based on preliminary data and is intended to cover the extent of what <i>potential</i> impacts could be. The impacts are generally presented from a broader perspective since ROW acquisition and final design are not part of the EA process and because individual property owners can change from time to time. The subsequent ROW and design processes then allow for the evaluation of each property in much greater detail, which often leads to incorporating design details that further minimize impacts in coordination with the property owner at that time.</p> <p>Better communication is necessary with property-owners potentially displaced by the project and UDOT is committed to finding more effective communication tools. In regards to the property at 415 N Main that was vacant during the time of the previous analysis, project team members have participated in additional discussions with the new property owners as part of the Chamber of Commerce luncheon and the Public Hearing on December 12, 2006. Baker representatives also met on-site with the new property owners on December 13, 2006. In these meetings, it was determined that the building itself could stay with modifications to the awning. As such, this building is not potentially displaced and the document has been modified accordingly. The employment information and service type for this</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>have had to face. I would not want anybody to have to go through this nightmare. Also, any letters sent out to property owners should be certified to ensure delivery, and proper research should be done to establish who owns a building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In section 3.3.5 of the EA it states build alternatives were discussed with Stakeholders. No one has more at Stake than the owners of the buildings to be removed. We have yet to be officially notified! • Your alternatives for this plan are very cut and dried - build or no build, with no option in between. You are not offering up any other options, when it seems that there are some other options, which can have a less detrimental and devastating effect on those businesses marked for removal. • Moab is a small community, and the removal of businesses, and the affects that it will have on people's lives is very detrimental to the community as a whole. Moab is not like a large city where something like this can get swallowed up and easily disappear. This sort of action will have a serious rippling affect. • In the EA Chapter 3 page 7 - you state "secondary effects are not anticipated because land development is severely constrained by the limited amount of developable land." How in that case do you justify the removal of businesses from the inventory that will not be able to relocate because of restricted development opportunities? • In Chapter 3.3.8 in the EA it states "Relocation services and benefits will be administered through UDOT's Relocation Assistance Program". What do you propose to do when there is not a like for like building available, in a location that is as good as the current location? • In Chapter 3.4.1 of the EA it states that the largest employment sectors are leisure and hospitality. How then do you justify removing businesses which are in this sector? Ours being a rock climbing and canyoneering guide service? • In Chapter 3.4.2 it is stated that heavy traffic congestion limits accessibility to the businesses located on US 191 ... There is no traffic congestion. Traffic slows down as it should on entering a town, but rarely does it ever come to a stand still. The worse time is during Jeep Safari Week. • It is also stated in this chapter that temporary employment loss will be 25 people. We employ up to 8 people. How can it be a temporary loss of employment for business owners like us, who could get put out of business? What do you suggest that we do instead? • It also states that these businesses do not provide retail goods. We plan on doing retail. • Myron Lee stated that UDOT has to follow a process for such plans, which cause the least amount of impact to buildings and businesses as possible. That is why there is a public meeting so people can air their opinions. He said it could be decided to make the road lanes narrower, put the bike path somewhere else etc to avoid the loss of businesses and buildings. How is it then that it has got to the stage where a huge Draft EA has been produced costing an inordinate amount of money, (which is more like the size of an Environmental Impact Survey), that has involved detailed surveys of land, properties, easements, tax 	<p>business was not considered in the previous analysis because this information was not yet available. City representatives have been involved throughout the process. The Chamber of Commerce will continue to be coordinated with during the design process.</p> <p>In response to the comment pertaining to traffic congestion, traffic is currently operating at LOS D during peak hours, and in the future would operate at LOS E. As explained in the EA, LOS D and E are unacceptable LOS conditions for this type of facility and result in inconvenience and delay for motorists due to inadequate capacity. These motorists include potential business patrons.</p> <p>Some of the tools that have been used to present the information about this project include general public notices, individual mailings, a project website, and meetings with City staff and council. In addition to the Public Hearing, which is a formal stage of the environmental process to solicit input from the public on the proposed alternative, each property owner was sent a letter inviting them to participate in the March 2006 workshop to review information about the Preliminary Build Alternative. In response to comments received from property owners who participated in this workshop, additional features were incorporated into the Preferred Alternative to minimize impacts to their properties. These changes included modifications to the typical section width and use of design features such as retaining walls. City and County representatives also participated in this workshop. Following this workshop, the City participated in a field review that was held to help address issues identified from this workshop. Electronic files and maps showing the extent of impacts have been shared with City staff and the consultant for the bike path.</p> <p>Though only one build alternative is evaluated in the EA, the alternative development process reviewed possible shifts in the alignment and modifications to the elevation of the roadway have been incorporated as part of the Build Alternative to further minimize property impacts. Since it is UDOT's goal to cause the least disruption as possible, only the alternative with the least impact was presented in the document. Details such as the removal of the awning are typically handled as part of the ROW and design process, in coordination with the property owner.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>income, possible relocation locations of which there are none, maps showing the removal of buildings, and only now are you asking for public comment? It has been suggested to us, by various officials including the Property Rights Ombudsman, that once a project has got this far, and proposed plans are included in an EA, it is highly unlikely that these will be changed. It seems like you are just going through the motions to appease the public, but their comments are going to be worthless.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is your policy to cause as little impact to buildings and businesses as possible, why are other alternatives, such as the removal of our awning, not discussed in the plan? Why are your plans so black and white? • If you are concerned, as you say, about the impact caused on properties, why don't you produce other alternatives in your plan that would cause less impact? Why leave it to this late stage to get opinions from the public, who have been blindsided by exactly what is happening, and really don't have much time to research • We are not against the vision of providing a better gateway for the North end of Moab, and for providing bike paths and pedestrian walkways, but we are against the removal of business and buildings to enable this project to happen. Your plan, as stated already, is very cut and dried with only 2 options. The Build Alternative is going to cause extensive disruption in people's lives when their businesses are ruined, and their futures and livelihoods devastated. If you understood how Moab operated more, you would know that it is not just a matter of moving to another location and starting over. In the build alternative, it would seem that there should be options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Do the road lanes and turning lanes have to be as wide as 12'? b. Does the shoulder need to be 8'? c. Does the walkway need to be 6'? d. Can the bike path and walkway go another route? A. With regards to the properties on the East Side of the road, The Adventure Inn and 550 N Main which houses 4 businesses, could other alternatives be looked at? What about raising the bike path and sidewalk on an elevated walkway/bikeway which would give extra space, and possibly allow for the road to be 5 lanes at that point without having to knock these buildings down. Surely, being able to keep these buildings, and the businesses, would be the best way to go, so that people's lives are not ruined. It could even be a cheaper alternative. B. We support Phase 1 of the project, the replacement of Colorado Bridge. C. Whilst we think Phase 2 of the project, the road widening from 400 North to Potash Road, has some good points, the human impact cost is too high to give full support. If alternatives can be made to avoid the impact to buildings, then it would get full support. 	<p>Comments from the public have been solicited from the beginning of the project and are an important part of the process. Comments have had a meaningful influence on this project. For example, the typical section was modified and the bike path does not extend through this section as a result of the comments received as part of the March 2006 workshop.</p> <p>Other comments expressed will require further consideration during the ROW and design process. In regard to the properties on the east side of the road, during the ROW acquisition and design processes, UDOT will communicate clearly with each of these affected property owners so that they may assist in developing fair, equitable, and workable solutions to the outstanding design and location challenges of this project. At that time, UDOT and the property owner will consider whether the use of design features, variations of the typical section width, and/or reconfiguration of the business structure can be used to avoid displacement of either business building and how best to minimize impacts to these properties.</p> <p>UDOT will continue to seek solutions that would avoid economic impacts to businesses in any sector, including leisure and hospitality. And, UDOT would only need to acquire the portion of the property that is required for construction of the project. However, to acquire property, UDOT must fairly compensate property owners, and in some cases, fair compensation may result in full acquisition of a property and/or relocation of an existing business. Because of this potential situation, the properties at 512 N Main and 550 N Main are shown as potentially displaced, but subject to further review during design. Property acquisition and relocation assistance, if necessary, would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and the State of Utah Relocation Program.</p> <p>On a regional level, private land use development is constrained by the high percentage of public lands and environmental considerations, as explained in the EA. However, this does not mean that individual parcels or properties are not available for lease, sale, development, or redevelopment. The survey of real estate options completed in April 2006 provides a "snapshot" of</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
		<p>the real estate market at a single point in time. Specific relocation sites are not identified in the EA since options available in the future would likely be different. The EA acknowledges the challenges associated with the relocation of the Adventure Inn due to the limited hotel/motel real estate options in Moab. Additionally, the remaining lands associated with both properties that are identified as potential displacements could be redeveloped either by the existing property owner or a new owner; however, the property at 550 N Main is more constrained because of its limited size. Should relocation be determined necessary, a UDOT relocation counselor would work with each business to minimize economic harm to these businesses and increase the likelihood of them being able to relocate back into the affected community. As there is the potential that either of these businesses may chose to not re-establish within the community, Section 3.4.3 identifies the potential economic impact to the community. When considered in context of the overall economic sustainability of Moab, the economic impacts would likely be minimal.</p>
#6	<p>I have recently learned of the UDOT road widening project in Moab. I have lived in Moab for ten years, and have watched the community grow and expand. Moab depends on its small business owners, particularly the young, motivated people who work hard to earn their future here. I am writing for several reasons.</p> <p>First, I would like to express support for your decision to leave 415 North Main intact, but to suggest that it is very difficult for its owners to move forward with their business planning without a written guarantee of the verbal promise. [The property owners] are highly respected and well-known members of this community. It would be unfortunate to hinder them in their efforts to move forward with plans to further a business which is extremely beneficial to Moab's economy and tourism. The purchase of a building on Main Street is a big move for small business owners, and each day that they are halted in their planning represents a loss of money and progress which can hurt a small business in its growing phase.</p> <p>Second, I want to strongly advocate the No Build alternative, as I understand it. I feel that it would be terrible to destroy any buildings which are being run as small businesses in Moab, as this would be very damaging to the individuals who have worked so hard to build them. The Adventure Inn, in particular, is owned by a young couple who have devoted everything they have to their business. To me, it would be unthinkable to strip them of their years of work. I am less familiar with the personal situation of the owners of 550 N Main, but I assume that they too would be highly aggrieved to lose their property and their business investments. I strongly urge you to support the No Build alternative. The road lines could be made slightly narrower, and the bike path could be started north of [the] rock shop, to save space in the road widening. The bike path that snakes around the center of Moab, circuitously and not beside the road, is much more pleasant and safe than it would be if it were next to a 4-lane highway.</p> <p>If the No Build Alternative proves impossible, I urge you to remove only parts of the buildings, and take the</p>	<p>See response to Comment #5.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>responsibility to rebuild the removed portions on the backs of the buildings. Not only would this be the most fair approach, but it would be the best for Moab's economy as well, as it would leave well-established small businesses intact.</p> <p>Above all, as a compassionate community member, as well as a fair-minded business person, I urge you to make a reasonable decision as soon as possible, so these people can go on with their lives and their business plans. This type of unforeseen situation can be an irreparable blow to a small business owner, or it can be an opportunity for the State of Utah to demonstrate fairness and responsibility to its taxpayers.</p>	
#7	<p>I am writing regarding my friends' business space, which may be in jeopardy, because of this "highway enlargement" plan proposed, or rather implemented. I am also writing because of my concern of the Moab community & its' future.</p> <p>This is a letter from the heart, so if your looking for statistics or anger, you will have to look at others'.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Moab, off & on for over 10 years. Inherently, from Chicago, & then to Durango, & Telluride. So, I have seen population impact...& am fully conscious of environmental impacts. (I once was going to major in Environmental Biology...but traded it ten years later for Environmental/Architectural Design & Building.)</p> <p>Moab....such an amazing place! The heart of the best "Parks" in the US. No wonder, it's compared to Rome & Paris! What better place for a walmart & a huge 4-lane highway! Does the community "need" it or does "Walmart" want it? I know there are many of us that are very tired of that trip to GJ. Especially the older we get & more children we have to make the necessity more convenient. Which, I totally can relate to w/my (2) year old! Am I willing to risk losing any character & class the community can w/hold from closing out a Walmart & more traffic...No! Just to get this straight...you are not widening the highway for the intense traffic that may occur here a few weeks a season..you have your own incentive reasons' I'm sure.</p> <p>Okay, I know this is not about Walmart...but I am certain that a road widening project is not for the "Moab Community." It is for those that will either profit from it. More than likely, it has nothing more to do w/Moab, other than those revenue dollars that pass through here every year. If you proceed as you are...you will ruin what Moab has to offer.</p> <p>My letter is to convince you to change w/etiquette. Maintain the home & businesses, as they are.. All over the country towns are developed relentlessly, fast & efficient...they are disappeared as towns we once knew. As the highway will prevail in its' planned arrangement..pay some respect to the community in which you are interrupting. We are here, & here's my voice. You build a bigger highway & people/traffic will come...inevitably. Just do it with class. Which Moab does not exactly have a reputation for...maybe we can change that, too!</p> <p>We have the opportunity to do this change w/class for the people who have lived here forever & for the people who lay down there souls to protect it...because they lived elsewhere & saw what happened. Please give these business owners a right to Moab. They were not planning on "your" plan. Their lives & your dignity depends on it now.</p> <p>I adhere to the prospects of Moab. I would love to have more businesses here offering more easily available goods. I would just rather see Moab benefit from this.</p> <p>I think your bike path is a great hit. but, I know the traffic that will follow your lead. So, Do Not ever say your doing it</p>	<p>UDOT is working with community leaders to develop a project that serves the travelers along US-191 and also benefits Moab. The purpose of and need for improvements to the Colorado River Bridge and US-191 are presented in Chapter 1 of the EA.</p> <p>Comment #5 responds to the remaining comments.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>for the community. Take your traffic through Moab...just leave us alone as much as possible!</p> <p>I'm not sure what else I can say here to help you to consider taking responsive action to the communities addresses. I know I do not speak for the entire community, though I hope I can merely guide you w/a conscious concern.</p> <p>I hope there can come a balance that adheres to the proceeding development w/dignity & integrity for Moab & all of us who live here.</p> <p>That's all...proceed as you will. I'm not specific here because you know what you need to do..to pay the business owners' respect...just do it.</p>	
#8	<p>I wish to submit my comments on the proposed lane expansion at the north end of the main street of Moab Utah as a part of the Colorado River Bridge project. I have lived in Moab for over ten years, owned businesses, worked in both the tourist service, and the construction industries in and around Moab, and I am concerned about the impact which may occur to local businesses due to the proposed "build alternative" in the Colorado River Bridge project.</p> <p>I appreciate the need to accommodate the volume of traffic which is passing through Moab in ever increasing numbers. I am certain however, that this traffic can be accommodated with minimal expansion of the north end road width, and consequently a minimal impact on the hard working and vital businesses at that end of town. I am sure that the project can be achieved in such a way that the businesses impacted by the expansion can be left substantially intact in both property and frontage appeal.</p> <p>I would like to urge those who will consider the planning and execution of this plan to make every possible allowance for the needs of the businesses in the impact zone. If buildings are to be selected for removal, then it seems imperative that the owners should be paid FAIR market value in a timely manner and should not be left on the line waiting for the final plan approval to receive compensation. Those buildings which may be slightly encroaching on the proposed expansion, but whose total removal is not essential to the process should be given the opportunity to be amended not demolished.</p> <p>Progress for the town of Moab, its industry, aesthetics and efficiency should not come at the cost of the lively hoods of those who have strived hard to help build it in the first place. Thank you for considering my suggestions.</p>	See response to Comment #5.
#9	<p>1) It is a mystery to me why bicycles and pedestrians require a separate bridge to cross the Colorado River. For the cost, it would seem that adding pedestrian and bicycle lanes to the highway bridge would cost significantly less than constructing two separate bridges. I have heard that the revenue streams are separate for these projects, but WHAT A WASTE of taxpayer money, time, effort, and materials to construct two separate spans for one simple purpose. My suggestion is to revisit this "forgone conclusion" and consider combining these two projects into one shared span.</p> <p>2) The typical roadway from 400 N to approximately 600 N is extremely wide given the fact that this proposal will decimate some businesses and the buildings they are housed in. If the proposed demolition properties were part of some national chain I might feel differently, but it is extremely hard to bear that this proposal will destroy livelihoods and lifeworks. My suggestion is to revisit this proposal to design a roadway that is as narrow as allowable to protect</p>	<p>1) Separating the bicycle and pedestrian facility from roadway traffic will benefit the trail system. The costs have been considered as part of each project.</p> <p>2 & 3) See response to Comment #5.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>business properties from being ruined.</p> <p>3) If it does appear inevitable that some businesses on the east side of Main Street require removal, pay a FAIR PRICE--not just for bricks and mortar but for destroying the livelihood of the business owners. Do it swiftly and do it right...no bloodbath for these fine citizens.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.</p>	
#10	<p>I understand the need for the project and that there are times during such projects when a few property owners might have to make some sacrifices for the good of the whole community. I am aware of the potential conflict with [the] building [on the west side of US-191] and the Adventure Inn. As for [the building on the west side], as I understand it, the actual building could remain as is with the awning being the only part being in conflict with the highway expansion. If the decision is to go ahead with your project then I would hope that this in fact would be the case with [this] building and that only the awning would have to be removed. As for the Adventure Inn I have been told that they would lose part of their building. I hope that during the subsequent planning processes that all options are explored in regards to this situation so as to either avoid this altogether or to properly compensate [the owners of the Adventure Inn] in a timely manner.</p> <p>I am not to familiar with the rest of the project but would also hope that there are plans to include bike trails. Thanks for your time.</p>	See responses to Comments #3, 4, and 5.
#11	<p>Thank you for taking time to consider concerns voiced by Moab business owners who may be affected by proposals associated with the US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project.</p> <p>According to the Draft Environmental Assessment, the Build Alternative anticipates widening portions of the Highway 191 within Moab City limits, and mentions the displacement of several businesses.</p> <p>The City understands that design and engineering standards sometimes necessitate making decisions that have repercussions on landowners. That said, the City would like to strongly encourage UDOT to look at options that will allow the project to proceed while preserving access and use by these property owners. We also ask that every effort be made to communicate clearly with the affected property owners so that they may assist in developing fair, equitable and workable solutions to the design and location challenges of this project.</p> <p>Thank you again for your consideration.</p>	See responses to Comments #5 and 7.
#12	<p>On or around the 6th of December 2006, it came to my attention as I was readying for a two week holiday departing Monday the 11th of December, and it happened just as I am describing, that the Colorado River Bridge Project in Moab Utah directly involved my husband and myself. Our commercial building @ 550 N. Main Moab (described as the Moab Realty building) was slated for removal in the later phase of the project for which currently there was no funding. Since it is obvious that this is neither the right time or the right forum for the type of comments that need to be made concerning my property as well as my neighbors property, the adjoining property to the south known as The Adventure Inn, who's home, business and future have been anonymously slated for removal or disfigurement as the Engineers</p>	<p>Most of these concerns are addressed in the responses to Comments #4 and 5. In regards to the properties located on the west side of US-191, each business along US-191 is important to the community. As such, the alternative development process focused on reducing the number of business buildings potentially taken, regardless of their location in relation to the right of way.</p> <p>As stated in the response to Comment #5, UDOT will</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>pencils lightly danced over the pages of drawings reconfiguring the landscape to include all their desires without a consideration of the real human cost or the logistics of such designs, I will confine my comments to that which should be submitted to this site at this date although I have been erroneously directed to voice my concerns here by both Lorraine Richards and Karen Stein. I have no real concerns about the project of the Colorado River Bridge widening and rebuild, it is antiquated and needs to be repaired. Marrying the four lanes from the bridge through town again seems to be a viable consideration. Someone has suggested a light be placed at the 400 intersection to slow traffic before it continues its journey through the heart of town, while not necessary, and not offensive, it should be considered that such a stop would create greater pollution considerations for that intersection. Quite an extensive study has been made over the last couple years, several hundred pages of economic and environmental studies to be more specific. It interests me to note a few things at this point: with the 2 properties previously described so integral an aspect in the completion of the project and with the Public Forum that took place on Dec. 12th wherein there were full color blown up posters of the properties, how is it that the owners of these properties were never given a name or a face and more specifically never alerted to the inclusion of their properties as the cost of this project. The City was urged to consider the financial impact of their revenues when considering the demise of these to properties wherein it was described that in the case of the 550 building they would only lose the revenues of property taxes and in the case of The Adventure Inn, the 12.25% tax collected on the rent of each room of their 30 room establishment would quickly be replaced by another hotel to be built in the future and that the owners could simply relocate to Green River and replace their motel. It was further described that after the "TAKINGS", and after the project was complete, the remaining "Prime Real-estate" (which there would be plenty) would be sold by UDOT for commercial use and it follows that the City would then reclaim its tax revenues as well as the "Project" getting a little help offsetting the construction costs. This really concerns me, since when did UDOT get out of the road building business and into buying or should I say "TAKING" real-estate and reselling it? My biggest concern is the basic nuts and bolts of this project and it's considerations or lack there of. Simply speaking, there is a deficit of land required to achieve the continuum of four lane from the bridge through town. Of course there is the road-right-of-way already established that provides the necessary land to achieve this goal. However, it seems that the west side of main across from the aforementioned properties where the Century 21 building, the Poison Spider building and the Maverick Station are situated are all encroaching on that Right-of-Way. These sites are clearly in violation and encroaching as well as the little triangular building further south. I was told a decision was made to take the deficit from the east side of the road where larger parcels of land could be taken and condemned and later resold instead of from the encroaching, violating side of the road where the parcels are so small that they would be used entirely with nothing left to resell and offset the cost of the project. I am not going to debate the merits of the decision to displace the east side of the road nor what you can or cannot do as far as "Taking" for the "greater good", but speaking from the point of view of someone who has already had to sacrifice my land,hopes and dreams for the "greater good" in a previous taking here in Moab, I can safely say this wreaks of impropriety and unfairness. To take from the side that is not encroaching and allow the violators who knowingly built and encroached within the last 12 years,to not be held accountable, is not fair. Also, to attempt to slate our properties for removal without even bothering to notify us in any way in a timely fashion is shameful. As previously mentioned, this is not the time or forum for further comment but I urge you to consider what I have set forth and amend your design requirements for the completion of the property accordingly.</p> <p>Thank You For Your Consideration,</p>	<p>communicate clearly with this property owner so that they may assist in developing fair, equitable, and workable solutions to the remaining design and location challenges of this project. UDOT and the property owner will work together to consider whether the use of design features, variations of the typical section width, and/or reconfiguration of the business structure can be used to avoid displacement of this business building and how best to minimize impacts to this property.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
#13	<p>I wish to comment briefly on just one aspect of this project. I have not had the chance to review the EA as I am traveling, will not have the opportunity before the comment period ends. I am a resident of Moab.</p> <p>I do not feel that any phase of bridge-widening or road-widening should be commenced unless funds and plans for restoration of disturbed roadsides are firmly in place. I also strongly believe that only plants native to the particular area impacted should be used in revegetation efforts. The highway 191 widening completed north of Moab a couple years ago created an ongoing nightmare of weed infestation of the disturbed roadsides. The weeds are spreading onto adjacent National Park Service and BLM lands. If the same restoration practices (or lack thereof) are implemented with Phase 1 of this project, weeds generated will also spread to private lands, the county's Lion's Park, and down the Colorado River. If there is not enough money to include native plant restoration in this project, I think there's just not enough money for the project – perhaps the money should be spent instead on cleaning up the weed problem from the last UDOT project.</p> <p>In the last six months the U.S. DOE has disturbed a substantial roadside area of US 191, near the proposed project area, in order to remove a top layer of contaminated soil. They replaced the removed soil with weed-free reject sand and generated a good list of native plants – to be re-seeded in the disturbed area. (I do not know if they have seeded the area yet.) I suggest their list as a good one for this immediate area. Whichever species list UDOT chooses, I suggest that they have a Moab-area botanist (not a plant grower or nursery) review the list before it is finalized. Botanists with the National Park Service or Bureau of Land Management could be utilized.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	<p>Plants native to the area will be incorporated into the design. Section 3.15.3 specifies mixes will be free of noxious weeds and other invasive plant species. The NPS and BLM will have the opportunity to review the re-vegetation plan during the design process.</p>
#14	<p>The Resource Development Coordinating Committee (RDCC) has reviewed this proposal. The Division of Air Quality comments:</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the proposed bridge and roadway construction project on US-191 from 400 North in Moab City to SR-279 in Grand County, will not require a permit. However, if any “non-permitted” rock crushing plants, asphalt plants, or concrete batch plants are located at the site, an Approval Order from the Executive Secretary of the Air Quality Board will be required for operation of the equipment, including all equipment not permitted in Utah. A permit application, known as a Notice of Intent (NOI), should be submitted to the Executive Secretary at the Utah Division of Air Quality at 150 North, 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84116 for review according to Utah Air Quality Rule R307-401. Permit: Notice of Intent and Approval Order. The guidelines for preparing and NOI are available on-line at: http://www.airquality.utah.gov/Permits/FORMS/NOIGuide8.pdf</p> <p>In addition, the project is subject to R307-205-5, Fugitive Dust, since the project could have a short-term impact on air quality due to the fugitive dust that could be generated during the excavation and construction phases of the project. An Approval Order is not required solely for the control of fugitive dust, but steps need to be taken to minimize fugitive dust, such as watering and/or chemical stabilization, providing vegetative or synthetic cover or windbreaks. A copy of the rules may be found at: www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r307/r307.htm</p> <p>The Committee appreciates the opportunity to review this proposal. Please direct any other written questions regarding this correspondence to the Resource Development Coordinating Committee, Public Lands Section, at the</p>	<p>Section 3.6.3 has been changed to reflect the correct rule (R307-205-5). R307-309-4 does not apply to this area. If an asphalt or concrete batch plant is required, an Approval Order will be obtained from the Executive Secretary at the Division of Air Quality.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	above address or call the Director, Jonathan G. Jemming, at (801) 537-9023 or Carolyn Wright at (801) 537-9230.	
#15	<p>I don't think you should remove 612 N. Main (Adventure Inn) buildings. They have been working hard to make their business successful in hope of retiring. UDOT could not reimburse them for their 5 years of hard work by compensating them for street value. Because you will be affecting this family's livelihood, I say – find another option. Put in a light at 400 North for traffic congestions. It is terrible there anyway.</p> <p>How can you write an EIS for such a large project and not notify the people, especially directly affected, of such a large scale project? How would you like it if someone did this to you? In your neighborhood? I think the 3 businesses directly affected are crucial to our community in Moab and I think you'll be "displacing" them elsewhere if you proceed in the same vein.</p> <p><u>What went well?</u> You had good pictures – GIS maps that were informative of our intentions.</p> <p><u>How can we improve?</u> I received a "Nov 2006 US-191, Colorado River Public Hearing" handout in the mail at work. After glancing over it, my eye caught "vacant commercial building...to be removed." I thought this would be a DISGRACEFUL way to find out that I'd be losing my business. Come to find out, it's one of my best friends (their business). No one NOTIFIED her! This flyer was the only way to find out the intention of UDOT.</p>	<p>See responses to Comments #5 and 7.</p> <p>In response to the need for a light at 400 North, major intersections will be evaluated further during design based on UDOT signal warrant criteria.</p>
#16	<p>[Verbal Comment]</p> <p>The property that I have is at 497 North Main Street. It's Poison Spider Bicycles. It's my understanding that the existing curb and gutter will be left in place and the construction will be toward the -- I believe what would be the west side of the road. If that is the case and it's not going to impact physical dimensions of our property, of our lot, what I would like to make sure is that the storm drainage from that area is dealt with in a more -- in a better manner because currently, there is absolutely no storm drainage there. In fact, most all the drainage from the road and from our, you know, roof on our building, but also from the hill side, it runs down into our lot. We only have a French drain in our parking area. So we are trying to deal with not only the water collection that we should be responsible for, but also the water collection coming off of the roadway. And occasionally -- I don't know the name of the canyon. It's the water that comes down and floods the Hacienda Restaurant. Occasionally, water from that hill side will come all the way into our property at 497.</p> <p>So I think the city has been quite remiss in providing storm drainage. And with this project, you know, this sounds like it's going to be a 30 or 40-year project. I think the storm drainage for that side of the road should be dealt with. That's pretty much our major concern from the property at 497 North Main. Thank you....</p> <p>We are in a unique place on the road because it climbs to our property and then it lays dead flat right there. So you know, what they have all thought is whatever curb and gutter is going to be there is just deal with it. All it does is pools it like a lake. Anything coming down pushes that lake right up into our property....</p> <p>We were hoping that was going to happen with the current or most recent road construction. And you know, the city engineer said, Well, we'll see what we are going to do. I had no idea it was going to be a temporary reconstruction. Really, what we are talking about here today is more of the permanent fix for that road. So I could see where at that</p>	<p>The existing curb and gutter would likely be replaced; however, no additional right of way is required from this property. A temporary construction easement would be necessary to restore the driveway access to this property.</p> <p>As recognized in the Draft EA, Moab, Grand County, and UDOT are working jointly to address existing drainage problems and flooding concerns independent of this project. The conceptual layout of the Preferred Alternative has identified potential detention basins and roadside ditches to handle the increased runoff associated with proposed improvements.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	time it kind of was a little evasive....	
#17	<p>[Verbal Comment]</p> <p>I have a concern on one of the displays. The 400 North to 600 North existing diagram is wrong. It's incorrect. It doesn't show the number of lanes that are there right now. It only shows two lanes. There are really two parking lanes, three driving lanes and a center turn lane existing right now in that area. It only shows two driving lanes and not much else. So I'd like to have that corrected. It makes it look really bad now. It's not that bad now.</p> <p>The other thing I want to comment on is I'm hoping that the parking in the 400 North to 600 North area doesn't disappear all together, the on-street parking. That is a pretty important parking area for the businesses that are there. And some of those businesses get pretty busy. They have some off-street parking, but not enough for the business they have at the Poison Spider bike shop. They need some Main Street parking. I hope it still is there. It looks like it probably is as part of the shoulder on the diagram along with a bike lane, which could be helpful as well. I'm hoping that is taken into consideration.</p> <p>The third thing is I hope that there is consideration being given to stop lights perhaps as far out as where Denny's is on the way into town. That would be a good place to slow traffic town with a stop light to begin with and to kind of delineate the edge of town. Then a traffic light at 400 North would definitely be another consideration to once again slow those trucks down as they are coming into town and slow them down even before as they know that the stop light is coming up. I don't know if there's a possibility of putting a stop light at the bridge itself where Highway 128 comes out. That's the river road. The river road is quite a busy road in the summer and lots of commercial river trip traffic, as well as just people sightseeing. On busy times, it's really hard to turn left from the river road coming into Moab. I don't know if we can put a stop light on a bridge where cars would be stopped on a bridge, but just one other thing in the comments.</p> <p>One more thing is I think the stop lights would also help slow down the truck -- the traffic going out of town from the last stop light, which is at the Poplar Place at 1st North. If there were another one or two stop lights, it would still feel like you are in town as you are driving north. A lot of people, trucks and cars, we are out of here. I think that's another real good reason to put -- considering putting stop lights in.</p>	<p>The diagram does not accurately reflect this section between 400 North and 600 North because it serves as a taper from the four-lane section in Moab, and the two-lane section to the north. The two southbound lanes start in this section, and the two northbound lanes coming out of town taper to one lane along the curved section. A note has been added to the Figure stating that it does not accurately reflect conditions through this taper section. The shoulders, lanes, median, and sidewalk are typically narrower than the proposed widths.</p> <p>On-street parking within the shoulder area will be reviewed as part of the design process, in coordination with property owners and tenants.</p> <p>Traffic-related comments are addressed in the response to Comment #4.</p>
#18	<p>[Verbal Comment]</p> <p>I think this procedure is very, very good. The procedure is good....</p> <p>I really appreciate this opportunity to express and to give my input. I have lived in Moab almost 30 years now. In 1977 I moved to Moab, so I know Moab. From my view about this north corridor, in 2004 I wrote a letter to the mayor and Moab city manager. At that time, there was a north corridor transportation hearing. I wrote a detailed letter about the north corridor.</p> <p>Basically, after I read this, this project background, most of my ideas are already in here. I'm very happy....</p> <p>Like I don't have to say it. It's already here. Basically, the four-way traffic with middle lane, the safe turn, all those</p>	<p>See response to Comment #16.</p>

Table E-1 - Detailed Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EA

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>points, bicycle trail, all those ideas are already in here.</p> <p>One thing I think is missing compared with my recommendation and this project plan is the flood water, taking care of the flood water because without taking care of the flood water, the highway really is not done, not complete.</p> <p>In 2001, there's a big mud slide and a flood. It covered the highway. The city and the county worked very diligently for quite a few days to clean it up. Really, on the north -- on that side, on this north corridor, if you get a storm come down, the water really comes down quickly. This highway right now, the saturation is -- didn't take care of any problem. So this letter I wrote to the city at that time, I hope the city address to the UDOT that they need to take care of this in the future.</p> <p>So my recommendation is the most natural and economic way is build -- construct a very scientific lane and well-built drainage, the water, all the way going to the Colorado River on the hill side, which is the east side.</p> <p>Even more important design now even before the bridge and before that because at least with design because people are talking about it. As a matter of fact, already with this bicycle trail, if one day the bicycle trail done, then we need to dig big trenches. You know, we ruin the bicycle trail. I know somebody said -- we would like some holes under the highway drain to the other side. Okay, well, that's already happened in some place, but that created trouble because we look at the big picture. We take care of the water all the way to the Colorado River. We do not flood the neighboring business. That's better.</p> <p>One day you took the holes and drain the water into the other side and the flood -- the water need to be taken care of anyway. It's public money. We are in the design stage. We have the opportunity while we do not design now.</p> <p>For some reason, I think this project didn't even mention the flood and drain. So that's why I come here to give my input.</p> <p>In the future, I would like -- if I have a chance, I would work for the city and county and the DOT to continue to give my two cents, my little efforts. That's fine....</p>	
#19	<p>[Verbal Comment]</p> <p>I work for the City of Moab and we have been working with UDOT and Michael Baker since the beginning of this. I think the process has been fair and they have taken our input and made adjustments when we have asked them to. I feel it's a good project.</p>	<p>The City's involvement and input throughout the process is greatly appreciated.</p>